DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 523 SP 017 428

AUTHOR Ducharme, Edward R.
TITLE Human Services and Teacher Education: A Time for Action.
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on Teacher Education and Human Services of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New York, NY, December 17, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Change; *Education Work Relationship; *General Education; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Humanistic Education; *Human Services; Interpersonal Competence; Occupational Mobility; Social Action; *Teacher Education; Vocational Adjustment

ABSTRACT

An exploration is made of the issues implicit in human services education and the responsibilities of schools of education for providing expanded opportunities for their students. Graduates of schools of education frequently go on to a wide variety of roles in addition to or instead of classroom teaching. While these graduates continue to seek and find positions within the human service sector, little exists in the way of accepted training for human service positions. The skills, attitudes, and knowledge of professional education are broadly applicable across many fields of human activity, and schools of education must broaden the perspectives of students by offering more diverse and liberal curricula. People who provide education and other human services are expected to have wide humanistic abilities and skills. Schools of education are in a unique position to provide these, particularly in their graduate study programs. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200523

Human Services and Teacher Education: A Time for Action

Presented at AACTE National Conference on Teacher Education and Human Services, New York City, December 17, 1979

Edward R. Ducharme
University of Vermont

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward R. Ducharme

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 017 408

It has been my dream since I first became interested in the possibilities inherent in teacher education-human services collaboration to see a conference such as this one held; an even richer fantasy was that I would be privileged to make one of the presentations at such a conference.

About six months ago, a friend of mine tricked me into joining him one morning on one of his mad pasttimes, that of running. For years, I had scoffed at runners and all their outlandish stories. Without telling you the whole story, suffice to say that I became a convert. You all know, from your own running or from listening to the tales of runners whom you know, that the only thing more boring to listen to than a reformed smoker is a committed runner. My point in bringing it up is that throughout much of the fall, from the day that I knew I would be giving this talk, I have ruminated on what I might say nearly every time I have run. I conceived dozens of brilliant openings, a score of controlling metaphors, thousands of examples. Let me tell you that thinking while you are running is like thinking while you are drinking. You know, it's midnight and you are having your second or third bourbon and suddenly the spendid insight occurs. The next morning, it doesn't seem half as good.

Let me share with you a couple of the controlling metaphors that I came up with. One is that of the Seven Deadly Sins. Any of you who spent more than thirty days in parochial school prior to 1950 know these: envy, pride, anger, avarice, sloth, gluttony, and lust. My plan was to show how teacher education has in its past been guilty of each of these sins, how it stands today still trapped in its own inertia, in part through <u>envy</u> of the other professions, <u>pride</u> in its purity of vision, <u>anger</u> at how the present and recent past have treated it so badly,

avarice for the federal, state, and local dollar whatever the purpose, sloth with respect to any hard work, gluttony for the fare of the societal largesse that others seem to have, and finally, lust for power. Then I thought of how each of these could illuminate our stance towards human services.

Another sun-filled morning it was the Arthurian legends that filled my head. Lancelot, with his pure-minded vision of the mission, the spiritual son of the king, ultimately the most dangerous because he could never reconcile vision with reality. Modred, the bastard son of the king, bringing about sedition because the king would never truly acknowledge him. Guinevere, the unfaithful queen, and Camelot, the lost vision. Now imagine a lightedness from fatigue and hunger and see what you could do with these metaphors. Relax; I'm using neither of them.

INTRODUCTION

I wish to open by congratulating each of us in the room. By a series of direct strategies which we may have planned and other events over which we have had little control, we and our institutions have survived the hectic financial crunch of the '70's with many programs intact and with an institutional commitment to school-centered education still visible and viable. And with the increasing predictions of a modest growth market for teachers and other school-related professionals beginning in the early '80's, most can probably survive into the '90's, barring, of course, some unpredictable calamity. As more and more marginal institutions falter, the ones remaining will have increased odds in their favor to survive for the next decade without major change.

This possible scenario would satisfy many in teacher education who have, for generations, been among the leaders in being led and

directed by others. We did grow during the fifties and sixties when everyone told us that we should; we began to cut back when we were told or when fiscal and enrollment data suggested that such might be the prudent course. Some institutions now anxiously await the next directive or imperative from teacher groups, governmental groups, or seat-of-the-pants logic. With a break or two, we might even make it to our own retirements without major change.

Yet, in truth, we cannot remain in or move back to a position of total preoccupation with school-related education. The schools themselves are not exclusively school-related. Teachers, counselors, and administrators increasingly find themselves relating to a host of community offices and agencies: drugs and alcohol agencies, corrections, mental health, welfare offices, unemployment agency staff, birth-related agencies, adoption centers, testing agencies, and housing agencies. It is time that our institutions take responsible actions in this need-filled society.

CONFERENCE PURPOSES

Most of us recognized that education occurs in a wide range and variety of institutions in addition to those things called public schools, even long before Lawrence Cremin so effectively pointed this fact out in his Charles W. Hunt Lecture in 1978. We know that this is true, but we do not do much with the knowledge beyond perhaps informing our future teachers and administrators that all of their students' learnings may not occur in school. We have failed, failed rather miserably to capitalize on this situation and educate for this broadened definition of the learning environment. In part, this is what this conference is about.

For some of you the purpose of this Conference is to determine

whether or not your institution will participate in human service education. This is an inappropriate question. Nearly all of us are beyond asking the question. We are all in broad human service education; many of us are in specific human service preparation. The more diverse our institutions, the more likely we are to be involved; e.g., we are likely to have social service programs, corrections programs, paralegal programs, allied health programs, and a host of others, depending on our size and formal structure. Even if we lack formal programs in any or all of these areas, our teacher education graduates often end up in positions in such offices. Our counseling graduates are increasingly taking positions in what are called by some "non-school settings." Our administration programs are increasingly accepting students who are already working in human service settings. They come back to school for new skills and knowledge.

Any of us who has spent time recently in schools, colleges, and departments of education knows that we are in the business of human service education; the question, then, is not whether we will participate or not but rather the degree to which we are willing to acknowledge it and, subsequently, do a better job.

In one northeastern state, a recent informal study of personnel files within one department revealed that of the over two hundred individuals employed in second level and up positions, between twenty and twenty-five had indicated education as their undergraduate college major. The trend in this unofficial search is promising; it indicates that more than ten per cent of the staff were trained and educated in schools, colleges, and departments of education. When one considers the high probability that this department has another twenty or so who were also in education-related programs; e.g., English majors who

took a certification program, the implications for teacher education institutions are staggering.

Still, we lack complete data on where our graduates have gone in the past two decades if they have gone into anything other than teaching. Some, we know, have gone into retailing and other business fields; others are still tending bar; others a host of things other than teaching of human services. Cynics and friendly critics of the human service direction have querried: Why human services and not business, why not bartending, why not used car selling? After all, one can as easily show that some of the skills in interpersonal matters that are revealed in business fields and bartending are no further removed from teaching than working in a community center.

The answer is, like most answers, a complex one. Teaching and human services reach similar feelings and aspirations within the profession of teacher education. They are areas of work that touch upon and attempt to improve the lives of individuals. They attempt to use institutions to serve human needs. They respond to the crucial gaps in people's lives. They provide an effective outlet and application for the concern and care of individuals within the profession.

Human services education is an extension of teacher education. The world of the schools is increasingly expanded to include concern with mental health, corrections, health care, community centers, and a host of other agencies. It is a rare teacher, administrator, or counselor program that does not include an awareness of these many agencies. It is, in fact, an unprepared professional that emerges from any program without a heightened consciousness of these other institutions. Many teacher educators have first had their interest in human services aroused by the experience of exploring these

institutions in the work with their students.

At its best, teacher education has been visionary and humane. It has sought to inspire in students feelings for people and their needs that would be powerful and productive, knowledge that would be relevant and helpful, and work that would be sustaining and personally meaningful.

Teacher education continues to attract students who are people and problem oriented. These are students who, with the assistance of supportive teachers, the experience of effective internships, and the content of appropriate curricula could become responsive adults who contribute to the amelioration of social problems. For some, the work environment will be the classroom; increasingly, for others, it will be the human services arena.

The actual programs in human service education undoubtedly differ widely from institution to institution. The small university like mine is perhaps known for developing educators for human service settings who are more generalists than specialists. Larger institutions with their multiple programs are quickly and appropriately including the training of specialists as well as the education of generalists. The resultant mixture continues to plague attempts at definition of human service education.

The central purposes of this Conference are to raise and clarify some of the issues implicit in human services education, to provide an interactive format between the initiated and the curious, and to form professional bonds and relationships that will enable growth and change to prosper. The group gathered here could easily be the next significant network in university professional education.

A final comment on Conference purpose. I want to say that half of us might return to our institutions and report: "I went there to

see if they are as crazy as I thought. They are, and we had better stay clear of teacher education and human service education entanglements." Even if we were to return and say that, such a response would make little difference to many of our students who will continue to use our institutions in their private purposes. The fact of the matter is that, for several decades now, teacher education students have gone on to a wide variety of roles in addition to or in lieu of classroom teaching.

SOME GIVENS

There are certain societal and professional givens that exist today and influence our deliberations at this conference. Some of them are:

(1) The roles in human service fields continue to modify and expand. For example, each new federal entitlement law carries with it a variety of explicit and implicit roles requisite to fulfill the law. A recent example in education, specifically, is Mainstreaming, and in society, generally, De-Institutionalization. These related goals have generated positions in educative, legal, financial, and community contexts that were largely unknown five years ago. Nearly all these roles have an explicit educating function.

(2) Little exists in the way of accepted training, knowledge base, and attitudes for entry level human service positions; much the same is true for other level positions as well. I say this in spite of emerging lists of competencies from various levels.

(3) Graduates of teacher education programs continue to seek and find positions within the human service sector.

(4) Increasingly, human service practitioners are enrolling in graduate work in schools and colleges of education. Whether

we are aware of it or not, the clientele in graduate programs has changed dramatically at many institutions.

(5) Schools and colleges have done relatively little up to this point to develop new curricula to reflect these changes in clientele. The developments that have occurred will illustrate the old cliché about old wine in new bottles.

(6) Most colleges and schools of education would like a piece of the human service action, particularly if they could do so without changing their current practices very much.

(7) Despite some recent slowdown in movement, job mobility continues to be highly valued by people. We are increasingly seeing individuals moving from one area such as teaching into another such as Agency management. We have some stake in this.

(8) Institutions will increasingly be given fiscal allocations based on effective service to defined clientele. One of the unplanned results of ignoring human service education-related work is that of poor data on student placement and validation of education provided.

FROM TEACHER EDUCATION TO HUMAN SERVICE EDUCATION: A BEGINNING

One of the common arguments that one hears is that the world of human service is unique. Of course, if one has a belief in the uniqueness of all human beings, it is rather difficult to deny the uniqueness, at one level, of any field, be it medicine, the environment, retail outlet management, teaching, or professional football. Yet one can still affirm the innate uniqueness of all without denying some core similarities.

Permit me to develop a personal example. I have spent various portions of my life helping people with their writing, working with

teachers on the teaching of writing, and doing my own writing. Last spring I had the opportunity to teach writing as part of a Title XX program in the State of Vermont. Present in my class -- which I co-taught with a staff member of the Agency for Human Services -- were the following: a corrections officer, a staff member of the state energy office, an alcohol rehab worker, a budget manager, a group home manager, and so forth. In twenty years of teaching writing, I had never taught such a diverse group. What happened? Many things, chief among them for me are the following:

(a) Regular attendence of all class members despite two-hour drives for some of them and a one-hour drive for me to their training center

(b) A major revision on my part of the kinds of assignments, readings, and assessment techniques

(c) Extremely positive feedback

(d) Good student work.

The point? There are several:

- Some skills and content are relevant to many fields of endeavor.
- Staff development -- my own in this case -- can and does occur.
- The needs of professionals from varied fields have similarities.
- Professional uniqueness is tha first claim of the emerging professional group and the last pretense of the entrenched professional group. Our society cannot endure many more "unique" professions.

We all need to test our knowledge, skills, and attitudes in similarly challenging environments. It is inappropriate to assume a priori that we are either capable or incapable of functioning effectively in new environments, that these environments are or are

not worth our while, that others need or do not need what we can offer.

SOME PERSONAL ASSUMPTIONS

I am proceeding from a set of personal assumptions which I should share with you. They form much of my concept of human service education.

(1) CSD's of education have a role to play in and a responsibility for human service education.

(2) The skills, attitudes, and knowledge of professional education are broadly applicable across many fields of human activity.

(3) The professional preparation of educators must become increasingly broad-based.

(4) The human service society is going to be around for awhile whether the economy turns up or down.

(5) The spirit and action behind the volunteerism of earlier decades are presently housed uncomfortably within the human services.

(6) The next decade will see an increase in the licensing and credentialing of human service workers. The October, 1979 Bulletin of the Council for Standards in Human Service Education indicates some of the possible directions.

(7) Undergraduates entering CSD's are increasingly less settled on teaching as a career and looking for alternative, personally satisfying work.

(8) Human service education is the most significant challenge for CSD's in the last several decades.

AN INAPPROPRIATE WAY TO GO

A seemingly popular way of responding to the challenge of human service education is to place it under the rubric of social work programs. Such seems to be particularly the case in institutions

in which the social work program is part of an existing school, college, or department of education.

It is a facile response and, in part, it may relate to some of the needs in the field. After all, social work has been around a long time and obviously has much to contribute. But such a response is deficient on several counts.

First, it implies that the broad-based needs of individuals in many kinds of work are best served by a single professional component, however rich or poor its experience may have been. Surely the work and accomplishments of social work are not to be denigrated. Nor should they be elevated to an eminence or prominence neither appropriate nor thought out. The social work approach is not universally applicable to the many and varied needs of human service education and providers.

Secondly, it does not well address the question of collaboration in professional schools. Social work professionals, schooled in the importance and cogency of their training, are no more likely to seek working relationships with other groups than are any other professionals who have been granted or have acquired turf rights to a particular field. Witness medicine and the law. Those of us who have looked at the emerging human services needs have been struck keenly with the demand for broad-based education that the field needs. Social work, like teacher education, cannot work this field alone.

Thirdly, it denies the very aspirations of those currently working in the field who, in needs survey after needs survey, continue to cite such areas as: teaching skills, management skills, evaluation strategies, counseling ability, writing competency, human relations knowledge, and so forth. The fact of the matter is that any needs assessment surfaces needs that transcend any academic unit that most of us have ever

encountered.

My intention is not in any way to discredit a legitimate role of social work in human services. No, my intent is to discredit any facile response to the challenge of human service education.

This Conference is addressing questions raised for an increasingly complex world, a world in which educators will be functioning in a wide range of arenas, a condition that precludes preparation from a monolithic base. In the future colleges of education will have to devise curricula which are less specialized, develop delivery systems which are less expensive and hierarchical, and foster a concept of helping service. Educators will have to become as familiar with economic and political issues as they are with learning theories: they will also have to be aware of the complex interrelationships of the human service society.

The kind of educators needed for a human service society are those who are willing to take strong public positions on social issues against the massive human misery in our cities, towns, nursing homes, prisons, schools, and other social institutions. We need educators who have mastered not only a subject matter or a new teaching procedure, but who have successfully resisted oppression in their work based on skin color, economic station, age, sex, or harmless social deviation. Educators must receive the training and skills to analyze sensitive issues as how to safeguard the public from high pressure advertising techniques, and how to critique economic and political institutions when they fail to meet basic human needs.

PERSONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS

In May, 1976, Robert Nash, and I published an article in the TC Record entitled "A Futures Perspective on Preparing Teachers for

the Human Service Society: How to Restore a Sense of Purpose to Teacher Education," a piece that we had written in the autumn of 1975, and from which the two previous comments were derived. We closed that paper with the following sentence: "We invite vigorous participation from our colleagues in what we expect to be a significant professional dialogue."

The intervening period has been a rich one in terms of the dialogue. In the nearly four years since the publication of that article, we have distributed over 300 copies to people in other universities and colleges, state government, national agencies, inquiring students, and others. We have published six related articles in a variety of other journals since that first one. Colleagues lacking in both insight and charity have hinted that we have published the same article in seven different versions. Visionary colleagues have, of course, seen each as a unique contribution to an emerging field. It has become an increasing irony to watch the development of programs regionally and nationally.

We ourselves do not have a program at the University of Vermont. There is presently no program a student can enroll in and graduate with a degree in human service education. This often comes as a surprise to people I meet at national conferences. After all we have been writing about the movement for five years now; if we do not have a program, who does? My quick answer is that very few institutions do, or at least of the kind our writing has implied. But permit me to return to the question of what a program is for a few moments.

One definition of program is "a plan or system under which action may be taken towards a goal" (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1977). In most IHE's that definition gets expanded somewhat in application

whereby it becomes that definition plus a precise prescription of the steps and stages necessary to accomplish the goal. Teacher educators have been historically fond of this extended definition. In that sense, we -- and most institutions -- do not have programs. What do we have? 1. Close to one hundred undergraduates in majors like Alternative Design, Interdisciplinary Studies, and double majors who end up doing almost all of their field work in social agencies and, upon graduation, taking entry and second level positions in public and private human service organizations. 2. Another group of undergraduates who do major in a teacher preparation program but end up doing something else, usually human service. We have dozens of human service providers enrolled in masters programs such as administration and planning, interdisciplinary studies, counseling, student personnel, foundations, and special education. Graduate courses that have appeared in the last few years include: Foundations of Rehabilitation, Community Organizations and Resources, Foundations of the Helping Process, Analysis of Educational and Social Service Organizations, General and Social Systems Theory, Ethics of Helping Relationships.

As I have visited campuses and talked with people like yourselves at conferences it has become clear to me that many places are in positions analogous to ours: much activity, a cadre of students, a potpourri of courses, a host of unfulfilled promises, and a remarkable opportunity. My strong feeling is that institutions that fit this description ought to decide consciously to do it or not. But we must be guided by the principle that it will not be easy.

THE UNIVERSAL JOINT

It was fashionable at a time in our recent national history to talk of a universal joint. (I know it is still fashionable to talk of

a universal joint, but I believe that is a different kind of joint.) The metaphor of a universal joint was an attractive one. Consider: in the sixties we were going to alleviate poverty by declaring war on it, pouring millions of dollars here and there. We were going to solve all the problems of segregation by putting kids on a million busses. We were going to eliminate institutional insensitivities by sitting in the president's office and not letting him or her go to the bathroom. We were going to solve all learning problems by investing in tons of M & M's. We were going to solve teacher incompetency by developing lists of teacher competencies. All of these "solutions" remain as monumental make-work projects or as dimly recalled memories. Most of us have grown up now, and -- for good or ill -- we no longer believe that there is a universal joint for poverty, for segregation, for institutional insensitivity and the host of other problems that plague us. (That does not, by the way, say that we have not stopped longing for the universal joint.) For me, there is always a special feeling of sadness and nostalgia when I hear Barbra Streisand sing "The Way We Were." The song always summons up feelings for a time past when I thought things were simple, that erasers on pencils really rubbed things out, that cause and effect always had the pure clarity they have in the science labs in introductory chemistry where the thing always worked, that the beauty and logic of mathematics had some application beyond the adolescent epiphany I had as a student in a Maine high school geometry class so long ago. Indeed, the longings for a simple solution, an uncomplicated past, are with many of us. But there is no universal joint, nor is it likely that there will ever be one. Living in a world that used to believe in universal joints can be debilitating. An alternative to a universal joint belief is a

compelling faith that informed work over time has the power to sustain hope, inform life, and renew person. It is this vision that must inform human service education.

Students, too, sense this tension between the learned and the unknown. They know that complex problems do not go away either because we talk them through, or because we paint them over, or because we spend money on them, or because somebody says they are not problems anymore. They know they will have to work long and hard to become the kind of competent professionals they want to be. The abilities they will need include:

1. The ability to listen sensitively and insightfully to the unexpressed meanings underlying verbal assertions, and to respond to these meanings with empathy.

2. The ability to elicit unexpressed thoughts, and feelings from clients when such disclosures can be helpful in resolving crises.

3. The ability to show concern, care, and understanding for the client as a person.

4. The ability to help others work through problems of self- and group-definition, whenever appropriate.

5. The ability to make interventions with individuals and groups at the "significant moments," without seizing power from clients, in order to help others bring their own power to bear on the resolution of their problems and on the enhancement of their potential.

6. The ability to use spoken, written, and nonverbal language powerfully and genuinely in order to clarify, inspire, and persuade.

LIBERAL AND GENERAL EDUCATION

Beyond these abilities, human service educators will need breadth of education. If ever our society needed broadly educated professionals, surely that time is now. The shoddiness that passes for liberal education on most campuses in the 1970's and presumably into the early

1980's -- they take even longer to change than we do -- is reprehensible. (Not only do recent graduates know little of what has been valued as culture, tradition, and wisdom in the past; they do not even know where to go to find out about it.) America needs, badly needs, leaders of breadth and vision, education and human services need new professionals of breadth and knowledge and practice. One aspect of human service education that must be addressed is the general or liberal education component.

Undergraduates in professional colleges planning careers as social workers, school teachers, nurses, mental health workers and other occupations receive a passing acquaintance with the general education tradition. They take unrelated courses in a variety of curricular areas that rarely promote understanding and depth of experience. Individuals pursuing such career goals, for example, study little or no literature, art, or music other than what may accidentally occur in an introductory course.

Yet, there is great expectation placed on the people who provide education and other human services to the society. They are expected to be technically skilled, sensitively responsive, broadly educated, and humanely predisposed. Current emphases in professional training increased importance on field-based training, internships, and other off-campus activities. Given the complexities of today's world of work, one must support these directions. There is, however, a resultant lack of opportunity for the broad study of the area of the liberal arts. Current professional emphases, combined with historic indifference and hostility by university instructors towards professional school students, may well be furthering a regrettable illiteracy.

The current reassessment of undergraduate general education

provides an opportunity for study and recommendations regarding the critical general education provided for pre-professionals.

A human service education cannot, must not be technically expert but fundamentally weak. The technology of educating, the buzz words of documentation confrontation, enabling and a host of others lead to facile descriptions and, on occasion, resolutions. They do not lead to understanding relations with colleagues, do not assist in the evolution of profound insights, do not lead one into self discovery and world consciousness. They isolate the unique to the detriment of the universal.

Individuals lacking a sense of history, tradition, and culture, can only facilitate, empathize, and sometimes identify. These, obviously, are important skills but they are not sufficient to inspire.

So many of us in teacher education and human services are skilled at helping others to recognize the personal problems they are dealing with, at facilitating an understanding of what unique qualities are either helping or hindering persons, at assisting people in "mellowing out" and feeling better about themselves. But much of it is so personal, so individual, so idiosyncratic. It is true that we, every one of us, are unique in very special ways. It is also true that, as human beings, we share so many other characteristics. The particular focus of our loves may be unique; the specific cause of our distress may be singular; the source of our joy may be 20th century in origin; our angst may be a derivation of our energy crisis. But love, distress, joy, and angst are common, shared feelings. They are the link to our union and understanding of the long line of beings that has preceded us and made the world both better and worse. How much better we would be as educators if we could only help ourselves and others to see beyond the peculiarities

of place and time.

COLLABORATION AND COMPETITION

We move slowly for many reasons. We may feel that realignment of some of our resources for this new venture in a time of diminished resources is unwarranted; we may feel that colleges of education have little business in doing anything that is not directly school-related. If students want to apply their learnings in other environments; fine, let them do it; but we ought not to be a party to the transaction. We fear the unknown; we have never been directly involved in human service work -- as artificially distinguished from teaching -- for any in-depth period of study; surely we will fail or be perceived as ignorant; known as purely enterprising; we do not want to ruffle the feathers of our colleagues in other disciplines.

The argument is made by some that any direct moves by SCD's into human services would be seen by some on campuses as academic piracy. I guess that it might. But when did such refinement ever characterize the relationships among the many elements of higher education? In a strict sense, it is not academic piracy inasmuch as no one on campuses "owns" human service education anyway. The worst word to describe it is opportunism. Surely, however, we ought not to defer action in a critical area merely because of what our non-colleagues might or might not think of us. There is work to be done, and we are well placed to do that work. The time to do it is now.

I will conclude with a quotation from the poetry of John Donne, a quotation rich in meaning for all of us who seek the resolution of complex questions in simple solutions.

On a huge hill,
Cragged and steep, Truth stands, and he that will
Reach her, about must and about must go,
And what the hill's suddenness resists, win so.
Yet strive so that before age, death's twilight,
Thy soul rest, for none can work in that night.
To will implies delay; therefore now do.

John Donne, Satire on Religion